FBI-1W

Dear Jim and Mark,

1/5/85

I've read the two thin and unidentified batches of Hosty material Mark got from the FBI and I got from you today. It is all self-serving, self-righteous, self-laudatory and irrelevant. Both it does faithfully reflect the FBI line in both matters once it got caught.

There is one record of some interest. Because they bear no identifications I can't cite any so I'll attach a copy. I recall no disclosed record that in any way justifies what this says, and at the same time I cannot dismiss it as a mere error.

It says that Oswald's had been contacted by the MVD s of the USSR.

I don't believe it.

On the incredible factual error in the panel report. I had space and I've d drafted an addition. I not only had it marked - I had a paperclip on that page tp draw my attention to several parts that I'd marked. And forgot!

Many thanks. I give it meaning.

Best,

Resumed 1/12/85 Because these are almost all nonrecord copies, obviously from a tickler, they lack positive identifications I can use. Where I've thought of it I'll have copies attached.

The first copy, typed sideways, was on a legal-sized page. I use the standard size because that holds what I am wondering a out, the statement that Oswald "was contact ed by MVD," nowhere to the Fain investigation. There was nothing at all like this in any main report I've seen. Rather the opposite, LHO's statement that he had not been. But was is confusing about this in that it can also be attributed the Has Carter and Brown. But the alleged MVD contact is repeated, which reduces the possibilities of simp le error at FBIHQ. Mark may want to consider giving this to Lardner or another reporter, who can then ask his own questions of the FBI. I suggest this. As soon as possible.

The first page of Document 1 in the next batch, 1 B 3 on "Hosty note destruction," is the first unequivocal statement I've seen that FBIHQ was aware of this. (I guess I should say that I recall.) It also refers to FBIHQ's "handling" of this on or by 11/24/63. This amounts to a confession of deliberate FBI lying to the Commission and the nation that early and thereafter in its line that Oswald had never given any indication of any t ndency toward violence. Which I think was (immune) perjury when Hoover and Hosty swore to it. I put the paperclips on. Again I think use should be offered promptly. See also 3 B 6.5

2 B 4, "Rosen characterization of FBI "standing with pockets open for evidence to drop in." My translation, th chief of investigations states they did not investigate the crime itself. Again I recall no earlier record saying this and again I recommend making it available to Lardner or another.

3 A admits the FBI had an "adversary relationship" with the commission. In giving Hoover credit for blocking Olney's choice as general counsel they also disclose that our First Unelected Ford was fronting for Hoover. 3C 1 reflects and emphasizes the FBI's pr paration of dossiers on WC staffers "after" Report was out. Blackmail only? The checkmark at 4. was on the original. Someone was emphasizing that the FBI and CIA (Angleton) were "pre-arranging" their answer to the commission. 7, referring to the FBI's preparation of dossiers on critics, exists in another form I'll come to. Note to JL: they had some notion of what they were told to do in 0322/0430.

additional note to JL: Is not this and most if not all the rest of this stuff eloquent rebuttal of the FBI's lie that it routinely destroys all ticklers after a few days? 0322 and other cases.

Note again on critics, C 7, "Subsequent preparation of sex dossiers on critics of probe." No wonder they had Phillips swear falsely. I wonder if you ought not try to find some way of getting this to the appeals court on that one question, what they were directed to do and how they lied about it? Did they need discovery to find this and all else like it?

The next attached page was separate, preceeded by a note about the kind of notebook used. Note that this gives a serial. It was disclosed and I used it in one of the cases to reflect that the FBI itself said I was fair to it. Until it decided not to like what I wrote. Refers to the Alan Burke Show on WNEW-TV. (New York City)

Note that the reference to Meagher is phonetic, Dallas to Director that I do not recall. Suggests overheard or tap. Later they had her name correct, including maiden name.

Hosty's 10/24/73 to Director, FBIHQ 67-194012-191, Doc. 34 (which also shows how FBIHQ can locate field office personnel records) states, graf 3, underscoring in original that he had had "an opportunity to review my field personnel file." This is quite specific in identifying the record's existence and filing and, if I do not recall incorrectly, refute's Phillips' attestation that there was none in Dallas. Unless, of course, the whole thing has been forwarded to K.C. In which event Dallas had a record of that and was deliberately deceptive. He is quite specific in identifying as Serial 157 as relevant in this matter and 0322. This also discloses that JFK assassination investigation records are included in the personnel files and why the Hosty search slip was blank.

What I told you over the phone, that Hoover, personally praised Hosty's perjurious testimony before the Commission is page 2, graf 2.

On page 3 there is indication that this memo was of 1973 because he states that is when he and Kelley spoke in KC, of which I'd known. Now that was two years before it was leaked that Oswald had left a threatening letter for him before 11/22/63 and that on orders he personally destroyed it. Here, living the fiction and hiding behind the FBI's false position, he states, 3rd graf up on 3, "I had absolutely no reason to believe that Oswald was a potential assassin or dangerous in any way." This, certainly, even for the FBI, is a rare way of referring to a threat to blow it up! (FBI's disgraceful, unlawful lifting of printed page 3 of his testimony)

Bassett to Held, 8/17/76, is an FBIHQ record not indicated as Not Recorded, so I wonder if the obliteration after the first graf, for which a b6 claim is made, is of a file number that could disclose what the FBI does not want to disclose. I suggest that you ask for its examination because pretty much all of the disciplinings and censures is public.

Page 1, graf 2 he admits what some in the FBI "are not being truthful" about the threatening note and its destruction. The reference to those "involved" must be some interpretation of "directly" involved because the last graf admits that 16 still working for the FBI admitted some knowledge.

Page 5 identifies this copy as from "admin Folder." 6 does too.

Repetition of Hosty's claim that there was no threat is amusing and he had to have been lying and knowing he was lying from his own description of how he destroyed it, hardly what Shanklin would have ordered him to do or how he'd have done it if innocuous. He went to the bathroom, shredded it and flushed it away.

Continues separately with third batch I received.

FBI-NO

The FBI devoted five volumes to that report and there was nothing in the world to prevent a sixth if necessary. So it is not space that kept all mention of that significant and suppressed matter out of the FBI's reporting.

In the language that follows the FBI lies without actually lying,"...all Bureau ~~personnel~~ officials and supervisory personnel were interviewed by the Inspection Division..." For all as of that time. This clearly refers to those still in the FBI as of the date of the memo, Example, Alan Belmont, as I recall, was not interviewed because he was ill. But he is directly involved according to HQ records I have.

It is inconceivable that once Oswald was picked up by the police and the FBI knew it in Dallas that Dallas did not cover its own ass by telling Hoover immediately that Oswald had left the letter allegedly threatening to blow the FBI office and police HQ up. It also cannot be believed that in this situation Shanklin ordered its destruction on his own authority.

What Senatudy needed and the FBI knew it needed is what happened on and before 11/24, not subsequent to it. For that I expect perpetual secrecy unless some errant copies are around if anything was put on paper.

Item 16 is a cutie because of its typically FBI conclusion. I must admit that I do not recall this affidavit by, or statement by SA Joe B. Pearce. And while anything is possible, I find it hard to believe that I'd forget his saying that "Oswald was an informant or source of SA Hosty and it was not uncommon for sources to occasionally come to the office" to leave an note for the agent running him. While I acknowledge the possibility that I've forgotten, with my from-the-first interest in Oswald as someone I think I do not believe I did. I therefore am inclined to believe that this was withheld from me. Bearing on this possibility, according to my office car file of subject files in the basement, I had none on Pearce. He was not by any means unknown to me. I remember him as writing memos "IG"Pearce," or investigative clerk, not an SA. I see this it in his affidavit. The FBI's phony conclusion is that this "was looked into by the President's Commission, and there was no substance whatsoever to this particular claim." How did the Commission "look?" It took Hoover's and Belmont's self-serving statements that the FBI had no connection with Oswald. Even though as the 1/27/64 executive session makes unequivocal, Dulles told the Commission that to lie about this would be right and proper and the 11/21 ex mess discloses the Commission's view that it would never get an answer and that the FBI wanted it to fold its tents and go away because by then the FBI had solved the crime.

A comment on how the FBI can hide by its filing and make a litoral interpretation of search slips to deny the existence or existing records it knows exist. Note that this is a tickler copy and we have no idea what the record copy may be. But this is designated for a single file only, that on the Senate committee. There is no indication of any assassination filing. So, the search slip would not disclose assassination filing and the FBI would therefor decided that Senatudy was not relevant and the record not responsive, responsive as it indubitably would be. It also is interesting that "Oswald" was written on the top, suggesting but not necessarily meaning another tickler filing. Filing instructions are never written on the tops of pages, only on the bottoms.

It also can be that what I read as Oswald - may be Oswald 2, or tickler.

BANNETT's statement on his appearance before HSC. (Selected pages attached)

The underlinings, the FBI's, are not typical and I suspect were made for probable indexing or duplicating in a tickler. Oswald is not underlined but in additional to what appears to be all FBI names, Ruby and Jarvello, for example, are. This suggests a tickler aimed at the committee's apparent interests, a control over information it would get, rather, perhaps, to inform the FBI of rather than necessarily control.

Bassett regards it as insignificant when there was a rumor he heard that before the assassination the alleged assassin appeared and left behind a note. (2)

Page 5, result graf, Barrett states that "an agent in Dallas had at one time opened a FCI case on Ruby." This reflects what is the FBI's practice, the keeping of records related to Ruby as a FCI. But none produced in 75-0922 despite my repeated appeals for it. This also reflects the fact that such records should appear on any search slips, and thus show automatically if a search had been made. (There should in fact be at least a dozen informant contact forms in the file plus the request for permission to use him and the granting of that permission.)

The questioning about alleged disciplining of the SA who used Ruby as a FCI and allegedly found him unproductive may be garbled in HSC's mind with a report I got from a former SA that Ruby has been used by Bill Ray Griffin (deceased), informant who had been disciplined in New Orleans before assignment to Dallas. (Griffin's hip-pocket informant

In general, the time, effort and emphasis wasted on the irresponsible theorizing of so many critics by the committee is apparent in this report of its questioning. That time and effort might well have been devoted to responsible leads not idle and unsupported theories based on distortions and exaggerations.

On page 13 Barrett reports being sent to KRLD-TV to get any relevant pictures. He does not report being asked if he got any and does not volunteer.

The SAC had been told by SAs that they were told "that the investigation was to establish that Oswald acted alone."